

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his examination of the present application, and for extending a personal interview to Applicants' representative Charles Duan. By way of summary, Claims 37-68 were pending in the present application. By this amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 37, 40, 56, and 63, and added new Claims 69-78. Accordingly, Claims 37-78 remain pending for consideration.

The Office Action rejected Claims 37-68 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In response, Applicants have amended the claims. For at least the reasons discussed at the interview and provided below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the pending rejections.

As discussed during the interview, it would be greatly appreciated if the Examiner would contact Applicants' representative to discuss any additional issues that may arise following this amendment, such as if additional relevant references are identified.

Rejection of Claims 37-40, 43-56, 59, 61-63, 65, and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 37-40, 43-56, 59, 61-63, 65, and 67-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,674 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. ("Levergood"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge and Levergood, alone or in combination with other art of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of the claims.

Regarding **Claim 1**, the cited art does not teach or render obvious at least "receiving, at the gateway device, the browser redirect message and modifying it to indicate that the stored original network address is the origin of the browser redirect message," as required by the claim. Doidge "relates to local area network switching apparatuses for routing and bridging data transfers," *col. 1 ll. 7-8*, but it does not teach browser redirection messages. Accordingly, the Office Action relied on Levergood to teach this limitation. *Office Action* at 4-5.

Levergood teaches "methods of processing service requests from a client to a server through a network," *col. 3 ll. 7-8*, which as an initial matter differs from the limitation of Claim 1 of "receiving at a **gateway device** a network service request from a portable communication device, the network service request including an indication of a

network address to be accessed" (emphasis added). Levergood goes on to teach that "the user causes the browser to generate a URL GET request 100 at FIG. 2A. The browser forwards the request to a content server 120, which processes the request." Col. 5 ll. 32-35. Then, "the content server sends a 'REDIRECT' response 122 to the browser 100 to redirect the user's initial request to an authentication server." Col. 5 ll. 46-49. However, Levergood does not teach or render obvious at least "receiving, at the gateway device, the browser redirect message and modifying it to indicate that the stored original network address is the origin of the browser redirect message," in addition to "sending the modified browser redirect message to the computer."

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, Doidge teaches away from combination with references such as Levergood, because Doidge teaches, for example, that an object of the invention is "to convert formats between different layer 2 protocols using special purpose hardware **without the aid of a microprocessor**," col. 5 ll. 52-54, and combining the teachings of Levergood into Doidge would contradict that object of the invention and frustrate the purpose of Doidge.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Doidge and Levergood, alone or in combination with other art of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 40 is believed to be patentable at least for reasons analogous to those stated above with respect to Claim 1, as Doidge and Levergood do not teach or render obvious at least "the gateway device being configured to receive the browser redirect message and modify the browser redirect message to indicate that the stored original service access request is the origin of the browser redirect message, before forwarding the browser redirect message to the portable communication device, wherein the browser redirect message is configured to redirect the portable communication device to the redirected address," as required by the claim.

Claim 56 is believed to be patentable at least for reasons analogous to those stated above with respect to Claim 1, as Doidge and Levergood do not teach or render obvious at least "sending, to the portable communication device, a modified browser redirect message based upon the browser redirect message, the modified browser

redirect message configured to indicate that it was sent by the network resource," as required by the claim.

Claim 63 is believed to be patentable at least for reasons analogous to those stated above with respect to Claim 1, as Doidge and Levergood do not teach or render obvious at least "sending, to the portable communication device, a modified browser redirect message based upon the browser redirect message, the modified browser redirect message indicating it originated from the network resource," as required by the claim.

Claims 38-39, 43-55, 59, 61-62, 65, and 67-68, which depend from one of Claims 37, 40, 56, and 63, are believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above with respect to the independent claims, and by reason of the additional features recited in each dependent claim.

Rejection of Claims 41-42, 57-58, 60, 64, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 41-42, 57-58, 60, 64, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,674 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. ("Levergood") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang"). Each of the claims depends from one of Claims 37, 40, 56, and 63, and thus they are believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above with respect to the independent claims, and by reason of the additional features recited in each dependent claim.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims overcome the rejections of record. If any further issues are identified or additional relevant references are located, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' representative at the number listed below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate

Application No.: 09/458602
Filing Date: December 8, 1999

expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 9, 2011

By


Jarom Kesley

Registration No. 57,046

Attorney of Record

Customer No. 20995

(949) 760-0404

11141922